

1993

The Two Hundred and Ninety-Ninth Report of the Curricular Affairs Committee: Joint Report of the CAC and the UCGE on the Review of the Transfer of University College and Special Academic Programs

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_bills

Recommended Citation

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate, "The Two Hundred and Ninety-Ninth Report of the Curricular Affairs Committee: Joint Report of the CAC and the UCGE on the Review of the Transfer of University College and Special Academic Programs" (1993).

Faculty Senate Bills. Paper 1340.

http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_bills/1340

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Bills by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

*Rescinded
See #92-93-40*

Serial Number #92-93--30

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Kingston, Rhode Island
FACULTY SENATE

BILL

Adopted by the Faculty Senate

TO: President Robert L. Carothers

FROM: Chairperson of the Faculty Senate

1. The attached BILL, titled The Two Hundred and Ninety-Ninth Report of the Curricular Affairs Committee: Joint Report of the CAC and the UCGE on the Review of the Transfer of University College and Special Academic Programs, is forwarded for your consideration.
2. The original and two copies for your use are included.
3. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on April 8, 1993.
(date)
4. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original or forward it to the Board of Governors, completing the appropriate endorsement below.
5. In accordance with Section 10, paragraph 4 of the Senate's By-Laws, this bill will become effective April 29, 1993, three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; (3) you forward it to the Board of Governors for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Governors, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

April 9, 1993
(date)

Leonard M. Kahn

Leonard M. Kahn
Chairperson of the Faculty Senate

ENDORSEMENT

TO: Chairperson of the Faculty Senate

FROM: President of the University

Returned.

- a. Approved ____.
- *b. Approved subject to final approval by Board of Governors ____.
- c. Disapproved ____.

(date)

President

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Kingston, Rhode Island

FACULTY SENATE

March 22, 1993

Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee
Two Hundred and Ninety-Ninth Report

Joint Report of the Curricular Affairs Committee
and the University College and General Education Committee
on the Review of the Transfer
of University College and Special Academic Programs

S E C T I O N I

Background Information

BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURE:

It has been five years since the Faculty Senate and the Board of Governors, responding to the initiative of President Eddy, approved the transfer of University College from Academic Affairs to Student Development. In the fall semester 1992, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged the Curricular Affairs Committee and the University College and General Education Committee with conducting the legislated mandatory review of this transfer and making a joint report to the Faculty Senate this spring. The review of the transfer had been mandated by both the Faculty Senate and the Board of Governors for Higher Education.

In his memorandum to the two committees, Faculty Senate chairperson Kahn asked the Curricular Affairs Committee and the University College and General Education Committee to pay attention to the following in conducting their review: "a) the delivery of the academic programs; b) the integration of the program with the Division of Student Development; and c) the effect of fiscal constraints on the unit."

The two committees established a joint subcommittee comprised of: Gerald DeSchepper, CCE (CAC Chairperson & UCGE member); John Long, EDC (CAC member); Paula McGlasson, THE (CAC member); John Montgomery, MTH (UCGE member); Frank White, MCE (UCGE Chairperson). Staff support was provided by Sheila Black Grubman, Coordinator of the Faculty Senate and Secretary of both committees.

During December 1992 and in January and February of 1993, the subcommittee collected information about the transfer of University College and Special Academic Programs from Academic Affairs to the Division of Student Development.

The subcommittee reviewed a number of relevant documents, including the original legislation adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1987 (Faculty Senate Bill #87-88--9, The Two Hundred and Forty-Fifth Report of the Curricular Affairs Committee: Joint Report of the Curricular

Affairs Committee and the University College and General Education Committee on the Proposed Transfer of University College to the Division of Student Development [As Amended]); the January 26, 1988 recommendation by Commissioner Eleanor McMahon to the Board of Governors regarding the transfer; organizational charts for the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Development and for University College and Special Academic Programs; the 1991-92 Annual Report of University College, with budget materials and additional information provided by Dean Strommer.

The full subcommittee interviewed Dean Strommer, Vice President McCray, Provost Swan, President Carothers, Dr. Eugene Knott, Director of Counseling Services, Dr. Bobbi Koppel, Director of Career Services, and former Assistant Dean Everett Harris. In addition, individual members of the subcommittee interviewed all of the college deans or associate deans, Assistant Dean Sarah Rockett, Professor Jerome Schaffran, Director of UYA, and Professor Wendy Holmes, Acting Assistant Dean for New Student Programs in University College and Chairperson of the Faculty Senate when the transfer of University College and Special Academic Programs took place. The subcommittee also reviewed evaluative comments on University College by students in University College and by University College Advisors and sent questionnaires to all faculty members.

With regard to a review of the transfer, Commissioner McMahon proposed in her memorandum to the Board of Governors for Higher Education, that outside evaluators be used and that an opinion survey of faculty, students, and administrators be included in the review. The five original assessment questions posed by Commissioner Eleanor McMahon in 1988 were used by the subcommittee. In addition, a sixth question asking for further comments was included.

The six survey questions below were sent to all faculty and to Deans and Department Heads. They were also used as a basis for discussion with all interviewees. It was agreed that while students are probably unaware of the administrative transfer, their opinions were obtained by reading through student responses to questions posed by University College about the services of University College. Although Commissioner McMahon had suggested that outside evaluators be used, the subcommittee members believed that an internal evaluation was adequate, especially during difficult budget times.

OVERALL RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS:

Responses to the six questions are summarized as follows:

1. Has there been any change in the availability of faculty advisers?

There was a clear consensus among the respondents that availability of advisers was not a problem. Colleges and departments have continued to support advisement at the same level as prior to the transfer.

2. Has there been any improvement in the special academic programs?

While most respondents did not notice any improvement, a number of them did. Those respondents who noted improvements did not see them as a result of the transfer and frequently cited that improvements were despite the transfer.

3. Has the overall quality of University College been maintained?

Respondents to this question indicated that the staff of University College, under the Dean's leadership, have maintained quality despite fiscal difficulties.

4. Has the quality of residential life been improved by the transfer?

Most respondents referred to long standing difficulties with regard to the physical condition of the dormitories. It was pointed out that programming has begun to improve in the residence halls since the move of Residential Life from Business and Finance to Student Development. While some efforts such as workshops, advising, and the establishment of specialized dormitories (e.g. wellness dorm) have been initiated, no appreciable change was noted as a result of the move of University College into Student Development.

5. Has an integration of academic and campus life in fact occurred?

It was widely agreed by respondents that the integration of academic and campus life envisioned by proponents of the transfer has not occurred. It was the consensus among those who responded to the questionnaire that Student Development professionals and the staff of University College and Special Academic Programs have differing concerns. Those of University College and Special Academic Programs were seen as primarily academic.

6. What other comments can you make on the effect of this transfer?

There were numerous responses to this question. Mentioned most frequently were the fiscal problems and the academic nature of University College and Special Academic Programs. Many respondents believed that while in Student Development, University College and Special Academic Programs has sustained budget cuts which were disproportionate as compared either to other academic programs or to other service units within Academic Affairs or Student Development. Numerous respondents also thought that University College and Special Academic Programs has an essentially academic function which is not well served in a unit principally concerned with other priorities.

On March 22, 1993, the Curricular Affairs Committee and the University College and General Education Committee met jointly to consider the report of the Joint Subcommittee and voted to forward their recommendations to the Faculty Senate for approval.